

asked that the Attorney General be directed within 14 days to be able to present all of the facts so that, again, the truth could be known.

I am disappointed that even after a vigorous debate, even after narrowing the resolutions, even after the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) offered an amendment to suggest that issues dealing with congressional staff, issues dealing with any other staff that could be utilized, a fair amendment, even after encountering a debate with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we would be willing to compromise so that the truth would be known why we had leadership of this House calling the FBI to go after individuals who were only expressing their viewpoint in objection to a runaway legislative process in the State of Texas.

That resolution was voted down, but we will not be stopped because it is important that the Committee on the Judiciary and this House not be known as the cover-up House of 2003. This body, dominated by Republicans, refused to pull back on the Articles of Impeachment on the President of the United States, William Jefferson Clinton, though many of us spoke against it. And their view was, the truth must be known.

Now, when there has been an enormous suggestion and allegations of abuse of power, the use of the FBI, when we have newspaper reports and testimony or statements made by legislators who heard from the FBI, who heard from Homeland Security, we still cannot seem to get, if you will, the truth that should be told.

So frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that there may be a reconsideration and we are going to offer another resolution of inquiry to be able to ensure the actual truth be told to the people of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan with respect to this issue because his amendment was a very advanced amendment, cooperative and collaborative amendment in the committee; and I would be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Mr. Speaker, the judiciary considered a resolution of inquiry into a matter involving the Texas legislature when many of the members removed themselves in an attempt to prevent a redistricting scheme that would have been obviously very detrimental to African American and Hispanic Americans.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time allocated to me now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this event is not the basis for which the Committee of Inquiry was created because even though there was so much harm and possible violation of the voter rights of Americans in Texas, that was not what the Committee of Inquiry was gathered to do.

□ 2000

The committee of inquiry introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) was merely to inquire as to whether or not Federal funds, resources, or personnel had been used in trying to locate the missing members of the Texas legislature during June 11 through June 19, and that was all.

It was claimed by the distinguished majority leader of the House, himself from Texas, that this was a Federal matter, and that there was a justification because redistricting was involved that the Congress had every right to inquire. Whether he is correct or not is not central to the question of whether we should determine whether Homeland Security resources, whether Federal U.S. marshals, whether members of the FBI, whether personnel in the Department of Justice in Washington were used in trying to identify the whereabouts of members of the State legislature. That is all we wanted to do.

In an incredible debate, which fortunately has been reported to the American people and is preserved for all posterity, in a totally party vote, every Republican voted that they did not want to inquire, they did not want to know, they did not want to find out if Federal resources were used. They did not have any interest in knowing if there were any Federal statutes that were broken, whether there were any possible violations of the law.

This is the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States whose responsibility it is to protect the Constitution and its amendments and preserve democracy for the people of the United States of America, a rather striking position, but one that is not over because we did not prevail in the great Committee on the Judiciary in the House of Representatives.

This is a matter, as the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has admonished us, is not going away. We are not packing up our tents and forgetting about this. We have got to show to people that the Department of Justice is accountable, that the FBI is accountable, that the United States marshals are accountable and that indeed the Members of Congress have a responsibility to know if Homeland Security has now been turned into a partisan operation for any purpose that

anybody in charge happens to think it is.

This is very important because with this kind of attitude there is going to be a great difficulty for the American people to have any confidence in Homeland Security whatsoever.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If the gentleman will remember a COINTELPRO was utilized against Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. It was a different time. This is a simple inquiry as to whether or not we find ourselves with a modern day COINTELPRO of 2003, whether Federal resources were used to track civilians who had not violated any law, and as my understanding, Dr. King and civil rights activists, it was determined that the COINTELPRO was excessive, that he was not a terrorist, he was not a threat. If anything, he was healing this land. He was bringing us together.

So I would say that it is appropriate for the FBI, of which we have oversight, to themselves want to be known to the United States of America as the institution that it is, with high regard for integrity and high regard for its commission.

PROVIDING AID FOR AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERLACH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is always a good thing when the President visits a neglected continent, and so I am very glad that President Bush finally got to Africa; but we must recognize and understand the history of the United States policy and the United States involvement with Africa in order to use this moment to develop a positive, forward-moving agenda that is mutually beneficial.

First of all, the United States has significantly in the past contributed to the underdevelopment of Africa and has been benefited from the geopolitical manipulation of Africa and its leaders, and that is a fact. In the past, the United States has endorsed and funded the regimes of dictators. It has secured and disbursed loans that have left Africa Nations to this day struggling with debt; and it has created a cycle of dependence that has left Africa importing resources, aid, and military support from others. That is a fact.

This cycle of dependency, however, can be broken if the United States would work with Africans instead of against them. Peace, however, is a prerequisite for development. There can be no nation-building without peace. Strengthening Africa's peacekeeping capacity is the only solution to limiting outbreaks of civil conflict and preventing them from spreading to other parts of the region.